

REMARKS

Claims 1-18 are now pending in the present application. Claims 2, 9 and 13 have been amended. Claims 15-18 are new. Basis for the amendments and new claims can be found throughout the specification, claims and drawings originally filed. The amendments to the claims contained herein are of equivalent scope as originally filed and, thus, are not a narrowing amendment. The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejections in view of the amendments and remarks contained herein.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1-14 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gligoric (U.S. Pat. No. 6,751,316) in view of McNeill (U.S. Pat. No. 6,671,371). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 1 recites steps of determining whether a first microphone is connected to the telephone circuit, and disconnecting a second microphone when the first microphone is connected. McNeill contemplates a system in which both headset and handset are always connected in normal operation, and the headset relay switching detector 500 (Figure 6) determines when the user is switching between the two. Applicants are not aware of any teaching or disclosure within McNeill that teaches the detection of a first microphone connection as Claim 1 recites.

The headset relay switching detector 500 (Figure 6) of McNeill is not used for detecting when the headset is connected, but instead is used to determine when a headset/handset relay is actuated. The transformer 510, pulse shaping network 515, and integrating detector 520 (Figure 6) are all employed to determine when the user

switches between the headset and handset. Disconnecting a second microphone when a first microphone is attached may make operation of a telephone more user friendly, but McNeill does not teach such a step.

McNeill does teach an amplifier circuit that allows “the headset adapter installation process to be more intuitive and less time consuming” (Col 3, lines 53-55). The installation process McNeill contemplates, however, involves adjusting “impedance and gain levels” (Col. 3, lines 41-42) of the headset output stage, not simply connecting the headset to the telephone. Because McNeill is drawn to a headset auto-configuration mechanism, and not a microphone selection method, its teachings do not pertain to Claim 1, whether combined with Gligoric or otherwise.

Claim 3 recites opening a single pole, single throw switch. The headset/handset relay 505 (Figure 6) of McNeill is not specified as a single pole, single throw switch. In fact, Figure 6 indicates that the switch is a double pole, double throw switch. This is not a trivial difference, as the present invention is directed toward minimizing cost, and a double pole, double throw switch is more complex and costly than a single pole, single throw switch.

Claim 4 recites detecting a bias current to determine whether the first microphone is connected. Gligoric discloses a detection circuit 25 (Figure 2A), but does not indicate that bias current is the parameter detected.

Claim 7 recites connecting the second microphone to the telephone circuit when the first microphone is disconnected. McNeill, however, discloses connecting a load resistor, not a microphone, to a telephone’s handset port (Col. 6, lines 32-34).

Claim 8 discloses determining that the first microphone is disconnected by sensing a lack of bias current. Gligoric discloses a detection circuit 25 (Figure 2A), but does not indicate that bias current is the parameter detected. McNeill discloses detecting bias current (Col. 5, lines 38-59). McNeill, however, does not use this bias current to determine whether to disconnect the first microphone; instead, the bias current is used to set "a proper gain level and impedance level" (via a control signal 75 that depends on the bias current) (Col. 5, line 60 – Col. 6 line 2).

Applicants assert that Claims 9-16 are in condition for allowance for at least reasons similar to those for Claims 1-8.

Thus, Applicant believes Claims 1 and 9 patentably distinguish over the art of record. Likewise, Claims 2-8 and 10-14, which ultimately depend from Claims 1 and 9, respectively, are also believed to patentably distinguish over the art of record. Reconsideration of the rejection is respectfully requested.

NEW CLAIMS

New Claims 15 and 16 are ultimately dependent on Claims 1 and 9, respectively, and are thus believed to be allowable.

New Claims 17 and 18 are independent claims which include additional features of the present invention and are believed to patentably distinguish over the cited prior art. Claims 17 and 18 each define the bias circuit as being attached between the microphone amplifier and the first and second microphones with a switch being located between the bias circuit and the first microphone.

CONCLUSION

It is believed that all of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all presently outstanding rejections. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action, and as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. Thus, prompt and favorable consideration of this amendment is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (248) 641-1600.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: June 28, 2005

By: 

Michael J. Schmidt,
Reg. No. 34,007

HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.
P.O. Box 828
Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48303
(248) 641-1600

MJS/mrn/pmg